

**REMARKS**

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 6, 9-13, 15-18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, and 33 and amended claims 1, 19, 26, and 32 are in this application.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 9-13, 15-19, 21, 24-26, 28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ludtke et al. (Pub No. US 20030210252).

Independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

“...a functional block, included within said data processing subunit, operative as a terminating functional block to terminate the data processed by said data processing subunit **by transforming the data to an image signal...**” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection, the Examiner appears to rely on paragraph [0018] of Ludtke to disclose the above recited functional block. It is respectfully submitted that Ludtke as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Ludtke”) does not disclose the above-recited portion. That is, Ludtke appears to disclose a trigger bit which signals that storage of a current frame is complete. The trigger bit does not terminate the data processed by said data processing subunit by transforming the data to an image signal. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Ludtke.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claims 19, 26, and 32 are believed to be distinguishable from Ludtke.

Claims 3, 6, 9-13, 15-18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30, and 31 depend from one of claims 1, 19, and 26, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Ludtke for at least the reasons previously described.


Although the Examiner did not reject claim 33, claim 33 depends from claim 32, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from Ludtke for at least the reasons previously described.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing opinions concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:   
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800